DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 569 SP 033 324

AUTHOR Theobald, Neil D.
TITLE The Financing and Governance of Professional Development or Partner Schools. Occasional Paper No. 10.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Governance; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Rewards; School Organization; Teacher Educators; Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS Partner Schools; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to: (1) discuss the requisite financial and organizational components of partner schools or professional development schools; and (2) identify structures and processes which will allow these schools to contribute to the simultaneous reconstruction and renewal of the public schools in which teachers work and the university programs in which they train. The kind of renewal that is envisioned for schools and universities is viable only if the arrangement is viewed as materially beneficial to all parties involved. Partner schools are based in existing public schools and provide: (1) exemplary educational programs for students; (2) setting for site-based preparation programs (coursework and field experience) for preservice teachers and principals; (3) inservice training for current school personnel; and (4) settings for a variety of school-based research. Partner schools will necessarily wed public school districts, schools and colleges of education, teacher organizations, and state governments into an economic union which involves a significant reallocation of resources within and among the four sets of institutions. This paper presents a compensation scheme which hinges upon the development of organizational structures that encourage increased output from the system and that seek to diminish the threat to the welfare of any of the institutional participants in the partner school model. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED338569

Center for Educational Renewal

THE FINANCING AND GOVERNANCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR PARTNER SCHOOLS

NEIL D. THEOBALD

Occasional Paper No. 10

February 1990

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John I. Goodlad
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP033324

PREFACE

The Center for Educational Renewal was created in September, 1985, for the purpose of simultaneously renewing schools and the education of educators. School-university partnerships were viewed as the appropriate--indeed, natural--vehicle for achieving this purpose. From the beginning, my colleagues and I saw "partner schools" as the focal point for collaboration. School and university personnel would work together to promote and conduct renewing schools. School and university personnel would work together to redesign teacher education, with a significant portion of each program conducted in a partner school.

The basic concepts align closely with those underlying proposals for professional development, clinical, or practice schools. Professional development schools, in particular, have gained such attention in the last two or three years that they scarcely warrant a definition. They are exemplary schools in which a significant portion of a preservice teacher education program is to be conducted. In concept, they relate to laboratory schools but seek to go far beyond in providing settings for teacher education containing all the elements future teachers are likely to confront in their later teaching assignments.

Given the national attention proposals for professional development schools have received, the time devoted to reports on their progress at professional meetings, and the growing body of literature regarding them, one might believe that their cultivation has become a movement. Alas, this is far from the case. In the Center's Occasional Paper No. 9, Frank Brainard concludes that professional development, clinical, key, or partner schools--as they are variously named--are virtually a non-event. The rhetoric is too readily

being equated with the reality, a reality that Brainard's research reveals to be embryonic, at best.

Part of the problem lies in the general failure to anticipate whose ox would be gored and whose would be fed by the rhetoric of professional development schools. As it turns out from experience to date, as surveyed by Brainard, all the oxen must learn to get along on a leaner diet--a familiar outcome of educational reform. Those involved must continue to carry their customary work load and conform to the existing reward system while exploring new frontiers and encountering new demands arising from this exploration. Teachers in the schools add to their duties responsibility for introducing neophytes into teaching. Principals become responsible not only for the education of children and youths but also for the education of new teachers and, sometimes, new principals. University professors become partners in school renewal, without giving up any of their current responsibilities. Further, the whole is labor intensive, seriously intruding on the research activity from which flow the conventional rewards of academe.

In Occasional Paper No. 10, Neil Theobald attempts to confront these troublesome issues, most of which have not been taken into account in the exploratory programs launched to date. His is a hard-nosed economic analysis--with "economic" couched in human as well as financial terms. He analyzes partner schools--the term used in the work of the Center for Educational Renewal--from the perspective of what is needed to assure no loss of satisfaction for any of the groups involved and gain for at least one. He then goes on to develop the intriguing possibilities of gain for all with loss to none. His conclusions are encouraging. But the caveats embedded in his analysis deserve the careful attention of deans and professors of education, on one

hand, and superintendents, principals, and teachers, on the other, contemplating school-university collaborations with the development of partner schools in mind.

Occasional Papers 7, 9, and 10 in the Center's ongoing series are closely linked. The first examines some of the concepts underlying school-university partnerships and the common ground for collaboration represented by partner schools. The second surveys extant practice and suggests that the move toward such schools is embryonic, at best. The third directly confronts some of the financing and governance problems that most assuredly will frustrate successful development of partner schools unless they are anticipated and planned for at the outset.

Neil Theobald has performed a considerable service in his analysis. I thank him and commend it to the school-university partnership in the National Network for Educational Renewal and beyond.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director
National Network for Educational Renewal
February, 1990

THE FINANCING AND GOVERNANCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR PARTNER SCHOOLS

		Page
PREFACE		i
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PARTNER SCHOOLS	4
3.	ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	6
	Elements of Improved Efficiency	9
	Efficiency in Production	9
	Efficiency in Distribution	10
4.	STAFFING	13
	Reallocation of School District Staff	14
	Reallocation of University Staff	16
	Intended Outcomes	20
5.	FUNDING	22
6.	GOVERNANCE	26
7.	CONCLUSION	28
8.	REFERENCES	31

THE FINANCING AND GOVERNANCE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR PARTNER SCHOOLS

NEIL D. THEOBALD

All other reforms are conditioned upon reform in the quality and character of those who engage in the teaching profession.

John Dewey, 1903

1. Introduction

The quality and character of America's teachers continues to be of vital concern to educational reformers as we enter the 1990's. The profession has been criticized for recruiting new members disproportionately from those who perform poorly on standardized tests (Weaver, 1983), and then losing its most academically able recruits early in their careers (Schlechty and Vance, 1981). Work by Hanushek (1986), showing that teacher quality has a substantial influence on student performance, has further increased awareness of the pivotal role teachers play in school reform.

Yet, as Goodlad (1987) points out, while reform focuses on the individual, "almost invariably, it is the institution or program...that requires attention." (p. 4). The quality of our nation's teaching force must be improved; however, attacking this problem by implementing "reforms" which require teachers to earn more degrees or receive higher scores on standardized tests ignores crucial institutional and programmatic obstacles to success. The purpose of this paper is to: (1) discuss the requisite financial and organizational components of one proposed reform, partner schools, and (2) identify structures and processes which will allow these schools to contribute to the simultaneous reconstruction

of the public schools in which teachers work and the university programs in which they train.

An underlying assumption of this paper is that renewal in schools and universities is viable only if the arrangement is viewed as mutually beneficial to all parties involved. While Goodlad describes this criterion as cynical, he admits that it is an essential component of the "symbiotic partnerships" he envisions between schools and universities.[1] Collaboration entails a sharing or redistribution of cherished turf. If any group considers the potential gain from collaboration to be less than the likely sacrifice, then they have little incentive to become partners in such a process.

School-university partnerships will be productive, therefore, only to the extent that each partner is able to satisfy the unmet needs of the other. Public schools have an unmet need for better teachers. In order to produce these better teachers, universities need access to exemplary school settings in which to place their student teachers and to conduct research on effective practices. This research in turn can be used by the schools to improve the educational experiences provided to elementary and secondary students. These well-prepared elementary and secondary students will eventually meet the universities unmet need for excellent undergraduate and graduate students. And so on.

---

[1] A symbiotic partnership exists when unlike organisms join intimately in mutually beneficial relationships. To be productive, such partnerships must include the following minimum essentials: (1) complementary dissimilarity between or among partners (see Clark (1986), p. 83-94, for a discussion of the dissimilarities between schools and universities); (2) overlapping self-interests and the recognition of such by all partners; and (3) commitment among partners to the belief that the potential gains in satisfying self-interests are worth the efforts and inevitable sacrifices of close collaboration (Goodlad, 1987).

As is clear from this example, school-university partnerships have excellent potential for meeting a variety of each institution's unmet needs. Effecting radical change in existing institutions, however, is an imposing task. Schlechty (1985) argues that rather than coupling existing institutions, reformers should help create a new organization outside of the university to train teachers. This organization--called the professional development school--would be independent from, but associated with, the public schools and the university.

In outlining his vision for the National Network of Educational Renewal, a coalition of 14 school-university partnerships, Goodlad (1988) calls instead for the establishment of what he terms "partner schools" in each of the settings, with the goal of simultaneously renewing schools and programs for the education of educators. These partner schools would be based in existing public schools, but would provide: (1) exemplary educational programs for the school's students, (2) settings for site-based preparation programs (coursework and field experience) for preservice teachers and principals, (3) inservice training for current school personnel, and (4) settings for a variety of school-based research projects. Clearly, the movement of teacher and administrator preparation programs and personnel to a public school setting will require a significant reallocation of resources within and among schools and colleges of education, public school districts, and state school funding formulae. The next section will expand upon this new model and will discuss some of the barriers to its implementation.

2. Partner Schools

Revised funding and governance structures are needed for partner schools because, although school districts, universities, teacher organizations, and state departments of education will collaborate in their operation, none of these entities will dominate this new structure. Currently, teacher and administrator preparation programs are controlled by the universities, instruction of K-12 students and inservice training for teaching staff is the province of the schools, various staff development programs and governance structures are directed by the teacher organizations, and the use of state resources is regulated by the state department of education. As they are envisioned, partner schools will retain a great deal of independence from each of these entities.

Therefore, partner schools will necessarily wed public school districts, schools and colleges of education, teacher organizations, and state governments into an economic union which involves a significant reallocation of resources within and among the four sets of institutions. Such a joint venture would be difficult to initiate and sustain even among institutions with a lengthy history of trust and collaboration; unfortunately, little such precedence exists among these four entities. Each is suspicious of the intentions and motives of the other parties. Many school district administrators and teachers view themselves as "in the trenches", while their counterparts in higher education and at the state-level spend their days "in an ivory tower" and "playing cop". A number of university professors see little incentive in the existing reward system for collaboration with elementary and secondary schools and view state policy makers as meddlesome interlopers in the university's academic affairs.

Numerous state policy makers, on the other hand, decry the seemingly limitless demand for resources emanating from public schools and universities, which they see as being combined with scant commitment to accountability.

If a bold innovation such as the partner school concept is to take root and flourish in this barren soil, it is imperative that the changes proposed be, at best, coincident with the self-interests of each group involved, or at a minimum, hold all parties harmless. As Goodlad (1987) observes in outlining the necessary conditions for successful school-university collaboration, ". . . marriages end or become marriages in name only when the self-interests of one partner are no longer satisfied by the other" (p. 18).

By redistributing scarce human, financial, and jurisdictional resources within and among these institutions, partner schools will almost certainly create a number of perceived "winners" and "losers" relative to past practice. As an example, university professors who have historically taught their methods courses on campus, may not be supportive of a proposal to change the location of these courses to a distant (from their perspective) school district site. Such "losers" can be expected to seek ways to delay, and eventually kill, such a proposal. Therefore, it is incumbent upon partner school proponents to develop procedures for compensating individuals and groups for their losses; if such a strategy can be successfully implemented, the changes wrought by partner schools would represent substantially less of a threat to any group's welfare.

The compensation scheme outlined in the next section hinges upon the development of organizational structures which encourage increased output from the system. This increased output includes more focussed, publishable research conducted on K-12 education, qualitatively improved educational

experiences for preservice ar current teachers and administrators (e.g., higher job satisfaction, superior professional skills), as well as a better education delivered to elementary and secondary students. The largest part of this gain can be realized by providing incentives to encourage teachers, university faculty, and policy makers to more effectively target their efforts and by avoiding the current duplication of services within the system (e.g., inservice workshops and courses which address similar material to that covered in preservice programs). In other words, the efficiency of the current teacher education model (both preservice and inservice) must be improved. However, some additional inputs in the form of human resources will be needed in order to implement the partner school concept. While the additional expenditures required to staff partner schools at 5-10 per cent above present levels are modest, the provision of such funds is indispensable to the success of this venture.

3. Economic Considerations

Questions such as how the preparation of educators can be improved are central to the application of normative economic principles to the field of education. At its core, this question revolves about the issue of how scarce resources should be allocated within and among educational institutions. In order to analyze such a question, it is necessary to define, in some way, the objectives and goals of the educational process. For this paper, we will assume that educational organizations are benevolent institutions that seek to maximize educational welfare, which is positively related to the satisfaction received by students, teachers, administrators, parents, university faculty, state policy

makers, and taxpayers involved in the process.[2]

The limitations of such an approach are obvious. First, it would be nearly impossible to operationalize this definition in order to actually calculate the satisfaction received by each group. The equations involved would be extremely complex and many, if not most, of the variables included are not readily measurable. Second, even if viable "satisfaction equations" for each group could be developed, normative considerations suggest that the welfare of some groups (e.g., students) should be weighted more heavily than the welfare of other groups. What these weights are and how they should be calculated is subject to considerable disagreement. Third, it is misleading to talk about a group's level of satisfaction. Students, for example, are not a homogeneous mass and the factors which influence satisfaction may differ substantially among male, female, white, minority, and disabled students. In a similar manner, the priorities of tenured, non-tenured, and university research faculty can be expected to diverge widely.

Despite these difficulties, this approach can be useful as a benchmark against which various proposals may be judged. While it may be impossible to calculate a numerical value for the satisfaction received by any of these groups,

---

[2] Analytically, this could be expressed by the following Bergson-Samuelson individualistic social welfare function:

Let: E = Educational welfare
U_s = Utility received by students
U_t = Utility received by teachers
U_a = Utility received by administrators
U_p = Utility received by parents
U_f = Utility received by university faculty
U_{sp} = Utility received by state policy makers
U_{tx} = Utility received by taxpayers

Then $E = W(U_s, U_t, U_a, U_p, U_f, U_{sp}, U_{tx})$ $\quad \partial W/\partial U_x > 0$ for all x.

For a discussion of the theory underlying this approach see Samuelson (1965), p. 219-230.

it is often viable to judge whether a change will increase or decrease a group's welfare. If a reallocation of resources increases the satisfaction of any of these special interest groups without decreasing the welfare of any other group, then, according to this definition, total educational welfare is increased and the change is beneficial. In the public finance literature, such a reallocation would be seen as increasing the efficiency of the educational system and would be referred to as a Pareto improvement.[3] In those situations in which at least one special interest group's satisfaction is diminished by a change, the proposed standard is whether the redistribution will create sufficient gain by the "winners" in order to allow them to compensate negatively impacted group(s) for their loss(es). In other words, if the change allows for a potential Pareto improvement, then by the standards outlined in this paper it is desirable.

As explained in the previous section, the possibility of such compensation depends upon the introduction of institutional changes which increase the efficiency of a state's teacher training system. The next section will explore the needed elements for improved efficiency. As part of this discussion, it will be emphasized that the pursuit of a more efficient outcome is not incompatible with society's concern for justice. The standard which will be applied was developed by Rawls (1971), who maintains that a program's impact upon the "primary goods"[4] received by the least-advantaged individual or group measures the program's contribution to social welfare. As publicly-

---

[3] The Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto developed the following concept of efficiency which is central to modern welfare economics: An economic system is efficient if all resources are used and all goods and services are distributed in such a way that it is impossible to make anyone in the system better off without making someone else worse off. Thus, any change in resource allocation is considered a Pareto improvement if at least one person is made better off by the change and no one is worse off. See Musgrave and Musgrave (1984) or Tresch (1981) for further discussion of this concept.

[4] Primary goods are the set of goods that everyone finds important to their lives, regardless the type of life they choose to lead. See Strike (1988) for a discussion of the application of this principle to education.

supported enterprises, partner schools should follow the lead of Rawls and choose among efficiency measures with profound concern for the welfare of the most disadvantaged and least stalwart individuals and organizations involved in the venture.

3.1 *Elements of Improved Efficiency*

Improved efficiency, which is necessary if partner schools are to succeed, has three aspects: (1) Efficiency in production, (2) Efficiency in distribution, and (3) Maintenance of market-clearing relationships. Each of the first two must be considered in designing the reallocation of human, financial, and jurisdictional resources necessitated by the partner school concept. The third requirement, which does not involve any change from current practice and will therefore not be explicitly dealt with in what follows, states that the level of services produced by teachers, administrators, and faculty members should match the amount demanded by students, parents, state policy makers, and taxpayers.

3.1.1 *Efficiency in Production*

Improved production efficiency can be generated when incentives are provided to students, teachers, university faculty, and others which encourage them to focus their efforts in those areas in which they produce the greatest output for the least input (i.e. are most efficient). While it must be recognized that partner schools differ from private sector industries in that the quantity and mix of labor inputs is relatively fixed (due to collective bargaining agreements and university tenure), the standard efficiency criteria still apply in which any additional resources should be allocated toward "inputs which generate the greatest increases in desired outcomes relative to their costs" (Kemmerer & Wagner, 1985, p.112).

In this regard the use of a university faculty member to teach classroom management skills to a group of preservice teachers may not be the most effective use of this resource. Similarly, the use of classroom teachers for a myriad of non-teaching activities each day may not produce the greatest output for a given level of this resource input. If tasks can be shifted to generate, for example, improved classroom management proficiency by preservice and inservice teachers, while maintaining the current level of interaction between classroom teachers and students, then this reallocation leads to a more efficient use of resources. This example is consistent with the general belief among economists that more flexible uses of inputs lead to greater efficiency.[5] Partner schools, by lowering the barriers which currently exist among groups, should be able to improve communication and reallocate inputs (e.g., people, money, time) among various tasks in such a way as to increase the quality of at least one output without at the same time reducing the quality of any other output.

3.1.2 *Efficiency in Distribution*

Improved efficiency in production is a necessary condition for the success of partner schools, but it is not sufficient. As discussed earlier, the redistribution of human, financial, and jurisdictional resources wrought by this process must also be seen as making no group worse off than it was previously. For such a situation to prevail, partner schools must also distribute this increased output optimally among the seven groups (students, teachers, administrators, university faculty, state policy makers, parents, and taxpayers) involved in partner schools.

---

[5] See Sichel and Eckstein (1974), p. 5-11, for an accessible discussion of the likely components of efficiency.

The values and expectations of these groups obviously differ significantly. For example, university faculty recognize that the production of knowledge and its dissemination through academic writing is the sine qua non for advancement in their field. If partner schools are to facilitate the involvement of these individuals, it must not only be possible for university faculty to write about these schools, collaborative inquiry dealing with publishable issues must be a primary focus. This research focus, though, must meaningfully address the problem-solving needs of school staff. A major incentive for school district personnel to participate in partner schools is the opportunity to tackle the significant problems facing classroom teachers on a daily basis. The extent to which partner schools can successfully research these issues and disseminate the results in a format useable for preservice and inservice teachers will be crucial in determining the success of this enterprise.

While expectations for school district personnel aren't as rigidly defined, an essential task for the concept's proponents will be to develop strategies which assist and support partner schools as they challenge much of the prevailing conventional wisdom in schools. For example, a fundamental cultural value in school districts, which any reform as pervasive as the partner school concept is sure to challenge, is that of egalitarianism. Staff in partner schools, by attempting to create exemplary educational programs within an existing school district, are sure to face censure from peers in other district schools, many of whom will view partner schools as elitist institutions.

In order to assist partner schools in buffeting such criticism, Goodlad (1984) outlined a plan to link renewing schools to universities and to each other in a communicating, collaborating network. The purpose of these networks was

to provide "an empathetic reference group of other such schools (as) they move successfully to practices aligned with these beliefs, weathering simultaneously their own doubts and the criticisms of persons holding to (the) conventional wisdom" (Goodlad, 1988, p. 25). In addition, though, as Sarason (1982) points out, reformers must be cognizant of prevailing cultural norms in schools and must take the traditional view into account in order to understand what is happening, and what can happen, to and within schools.

An optimal distribution of resources among these groups demands that each group's priorities be used as weights to guide the assignment of roles and expectations in partner schools. The potential for increased output (e.g., more focussed, publishable research, higher job satisfaction and skill development for preservice and current teachers and administrators) with roles and tasks distributed in accordance with the priorities of each group provides strong justification for the reallocation of resources required by partner schools.

Strike, however, argues that goodness of outcome is only one of three standards which must be considered in justifying an allocation of resources. The second criterion asks if the decision making process for the allocation is fair and legitimate. The process outlined above for allocating tasks in a partner school parallels that used to sell a piece of art. Much as an art object is sold to the highest bidder in an auction, tasks in a partner school would be allocated to those who place the greatest value on the assignment. The first major task of the partner school program planning committee would be to develop a set of priorities for each group involved in the project. If this process is to meet the criterion of being fair and legitimate, then this planning committee must

accurately reflect the balance of interests involved in partner schools and must work in a democratic fashion.[6]

Strike's third standard is whether the resulting allocation is just. In an imperfect world, this may be seen as a relative, rather than absolute standard. Will partner schools make the allocation of educational resources more just? The process outlined here is intended to be consistent with Rawls' emphasis upon equalization of life prospects. Those who are worst off should receive highest priority when apportioning benefits. It is precisely those individuals least advantaged by the current teacher preparation model (i.e., students and preservice teachers) who stand to gain most from the qualitatively improved experiences promised by partner schools. The reallocation of resources required by partner schools can therefore be justified on all three of Strike's criteria: goodness of outcome, legitimacy of process, and justice in allocation, with justice defined using the Rawlsian standard of providing the greatest gain to the least advantaged.

4. Staffing

Partner schools will be revitalizing institutions specifically charged with providing exemplary educational programs for K-12 students, coursework and field experiences for preservice teachers and principals, inservice training for current school personnel, and settings for a variety of school-based research projects. This expanded vision will require a reallocation of human resources within and among schools and colleges of education and public school districts, with concurrent changes in state school funding formulae.

---

[6] See section six for further discussion of this issue.

4.1 *Reallocation of School District Staff*

The goal in reallocating school personnel is to staff partner schools appropriately in order to provide teachers and principals with the time needed to: (1) reflect upon current practices in elementary and secondary education, (2) work with university faculty to create knowledge upon which effective new practice can be based, and (3) assume tasks previously assigned to university employees (e.g., supervision of preservice teachers) and school district central office staff (e.g., peer coaching, staff development). The additional expense involved in such a change should be partially recaptured due to such factors as reduced staff development costs at the central office level and elimination of costs incurred by universities for supervisory and mentor teachers.

The additional expense involved in appropriately staffing partner schools varies with two organizational factors. The first is the number of preservice teachers per partner school. A key component to the partner school concept is the development of a cohort group of preservice teachers in each building. These preservice teachers, in tandem with a principal intern, will form a "shadow faculty" within each school, working under the direction of the school's current faculty. This "shadow faculty" should be large enough in number to reflect the diversity of a school staff and to allow for the provision of cost-effective university coursework and faculty involvement.

On both of these criteria, a minimum of 6-10 preservice teachers per elementary site and 12-15 preservice teachers at each secondary site would seem warranted. Cohort groups of this size would allow a wide variety of grade levels/subject areas to be represented and would provide sufficient numbers of preservice teachers to make practical a significant presence of university faculty

in the building. The current model of 1-2 preservice teachers per building would disperse the presence of university faculty among a large number of buildings and would create significant constraints in terms of travel time and the amount of time faculty could allocate to any one site. In addition, economies of scale require 25-30 students within a very limited geographical region if site-based university preservice and inservice coursework is to be delivered in a cost-effective manner.

The second factor driving partner school costs is the amount of reallocated time supported per classroom teacher. A partner school providing instruction over a six-hour day (with one hour devoted to planning time) may decide, for example, to provide each intern with one hour of non-classroom faculty time per day. A school with a large cohort of preservice teachers relative to the size of its staff (one for every two classroom teachers), would need to increase its number of full-time-equivalent teachers by ten per cent to meet this staffing goal.[7] A partner school with a smaller cohort of preservice teachers relative to the size of its staff (one for every four classroom teachers), would need to increase its number of full-time-equivalent teachers by five per cent.[8]

In almost all cases, the preservice principals receiving training in partner schools will be teachers who must leave their positions at least half the day. In order to make this option feasible for a wide variety of teachers, and to build a pool of well-trained future educational leaders, the state should establish

---

[7] A 2:1 classroom teacher to preservice teacher staff ratio means that for every X preservice teachers, the partner school will have 2X classroom teachers. If a full-time classroom teacher is responsible for five hours of instruction per day, the school provides a total of 10X hours of instruction per day. In order to provide one hour of non-classroom faculty time per day for each of the X preservice teachers, the partner school must be staffed with 11X hours of classroom teacher time per day (the current 10X hours for instruction plus X hours to work with preservice teachers). This requires a ten per cent increase in the number of full-time-equivalent classroom teachers.

[8] An increase from 20X hours of classroom teacher time per day to 21X hours (see footnote 7).

fellowships which will pay districts the cost of hiring replacement teachers while these preservice principals continue to draw their full salary. As Goodlad (1984) pointed out in justifying a similar plan, "States might well underwrite the costs involved by eliminating much of the cumbersome, costly machinery now required for accrediting (principal preparation) programs. . ." (p. 307).

Since any additional teachers hired by a school district tend to be paid from the lower end of the salary schedule, the additional personnel costs involved in providing 100 preservice teachers with one period of one-on-one non-classroom faculty time per day in partner schools providing instruction over a six-hour day would be a maximum of $300,000-$600,000.[9] As a less expensive alternative, partner schools could reassign faculty to meet with groups of 3-4 preservice teachers. The additional cost incurred under this scenario would range between $75,000-$200,000. The costs of fellowships for 10 preservice principals would be an additional $300,000.

4.2 *Reallocation of University Staff*

Partner schools will address the two bedrock issues involved in school improvement: the need to recruit, train, and retain excellent teachers and the necessity of renewing the schools in which teachers work in order to elicit and nurture superior teaching. These schools will place a very different set of demands on education faculty than those under which they currently operate. While this alternative conception of the role of university faculty should not require any significant increase in financial resources, it will necessitate a reordering of priorities within the professoriate. Specifically, the current

---

[9] This figure assumes that total compensation (salary plus benefits) for the 10-20 additional teachers hired will not exceed an average of $30,000 per teacher.

emphasis on pure research, at the expense of teacher and administrator training[10], must be reexamined.

In comparison to elementary and secondary teachers, university faculty enjoy considerable flexibility and variety in the tasks to which they allocate their labor. In most cases, teachers are required by union agreements to be in the school building at least 20 minutes before classes begin, to teach for 4-6 hours each day, and remain in the building for at least 20 minutes after classes end. Teachers are necessarily site-bound, with the use of the vast majority of their time governed by collective bargaining agreements and administrators. Professors in the major research universities, on the other hand, teach less than ten hours per week and have a great deal more freedom in organizing their research, teaching, and service activities. The assertion made earlier that the advent of partner schools should not require any significant increase in financial resources for university faculty assumes that universities will encourage professors to take advantage of this flexibility and channel their energies into creating exemplary teacher and administrator preparation programs and conducting meaningful research in schools.

A great deal of rhetoric has been generated in schools and colleges of education about the importance of teacher and administrator preparation programs. Yet, in the current academic ethos, it would require an act of considerable determination and courage for faculty members--especially those below the rank of full professor--to unilaterally commit themselves to the professionally demanding activities involved in partner schools. Recent history suggests that theoretical work conducted on-campus, similar to research

---

10 See Clifford and Guthrie (1988) for a lengthy discussion of the evolution of this phenomenon and presentation of proposed reforms.

conducted in the arts and sciences, is a much more promising route to tenure and promotion (Clifford & Guthrie, p. 337). Unless the rhetoric about the value of teacher and administrator preparation is matched by action on the part of those in leadership positions (i.e., deans and provosts), university faculty have little incentive to involve themselves in the fundamental concerns of the profession which schools of education were created to serve.

As an example of how a university might staff a partner school, assume that four university faculty members each currently teach preservice teachers six hours per quarter (semester). Under the partner school staffing plan[11], three of these faculty members would be responsible for overseeing the instructional component of the preservice experience in collaboration with the reallocated school personnel described above. The fourth member would be responsible for directing the research mission of the partner schools during that year. Each of the four faculty members would rotate into this research position every fourth year.

During any one quarter (semester), two of the three teaching faculty members would be located in the partner school. Given the greatly increased teaching load these two faculty members would face, they would have little available time for research and writing during this period. The third member of that year's teaching faculty would remain on-campus to focus upon organizing, writing, and disseminating research results. A sample staffing plan for a

11 The plan outlined here is based upon the staffing plan currently used at the University of Washington for its Danforth principal preparation program.

university operating under the quarter system could be:

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
Responsibility	Aut.	Win.	Spr.	Aut.	Win.	Spr.	Aut.	Win.	Spr.	Aut.	Win.	Spr.
Teaching	A,B	A,C	B,C	A,B	A,D	B,D	A,D	A,C	C,D	D,B	C,D	B,C
Writing	C	B	A	D	B	A	C	D	A	C	B	D
Research	D	D	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	A

Under this plan, professors A and B, along with reallocated school staff, would be responsible for delivering preservice and inservice instruction in the partner schools during the first quarter (Aut.) of Year 1. During this quarter, professor C would remain on campus to write and professor D would begin a year-long research project in the partner school site. The curriculum would be organized so that professors A, B, and D can deliver the first quarter's material, professor's A, C, and D can deliver the second quarter's material, and professors B, C, and D can deliver the third quarter's material.

A sample staffing plan for a university operating under the semester system could be:

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
Responsibility	Aut.	Spr.	Aut.	Spr.	Aut.	Spr.	Aut.	Spr.
Teaching	A,B	B,C	A,D	A,B	A,D	C,D	C,D	B,C
Writing	C	A	B	D	C	A	B	D
Research	D	D	C	C	B	B	A	A

Under this plan, professors A and B, along with reallocated school staff, would be responsible for delivering preservice and inservice instruction in the partner schools during the first semester (Aut.) of Year 1. During this semester, professor C would remain on campus to write and professor D would begin a year-long research project in the partner school site. A shortcoming of the semester plan, though, is that it is not flexible enough to allow the curriculum to be tailored to each professor's specialty. Unlike the quarter system plan, each professor must be able to deliver each semester's course material.

The only additional expenditure required by this process would be the cost involved in hiring a university staff member or a non-tenure track faculty member to coordinate the activities of the partner school. This individual would act in a supporting role to facilitate each strand of the operation and act as intermediary among the various groups. As mentioned earlier, this arrangement depends upon the placement of 25-30 preservice students within a very limited geographical area in order to allow site-based university preservice and inservice coursework to be delivered in a cost-effective manner.

4.3 *Intended Outcomes*

What return will the investment outlined above yield? One way to view the change would be to project its impact on a typical middle school with 500 students and 30 classroom teachers. Assume that the staff currently teaches five hours per day, with one hour per day provided for preparation time. Staff development is provided throughout the year in afterschool and Saturday sessions. The school serves as the field experience site for 2-3 preservice teachers per year who have completed their university coursework and are

working full-time with a mentor teacher who is paid a moderate sum for this task. In addition, the university employs a field supervisor to oversee the internship.

Under the partner school concept, this school could become the site for the preparation of 15 preservice teachers and one principal intern. This "shadow faculty" is in the classroom four periods per day, with an additional period dedicated to preparation time. The sixth period of the day is spent working with university professors and school staff, who are reallocated for this purpose, addressing and seeking solutions to problems which have arisen in the school's classrooms. In order to provide this reallocated time, the school will be staffed with three additional full-time teachers; in addition, a replacement for the preservice principal must be funded.

The "average" teacher in the school will now teach 22 hours per week instead of the previous 25 hours. Under a differentiated staffing plan, this may translate into 18 teachers teaching five hours per day, while 15 master teachers teach four hours per day and work with the "shadow faculty" during the fifth period. If no differentiation among staff is desired, wider involvement in the preservice program could be accommodated with all 33 teachers involved for slightly less than one-half hour per day, with the one-half course teaching load being shared through a team-teaching arrangement. Rather than earning inservice credits after school and on Saturdays, each classroom teacher could be involved in credit-producing inservice work with the "shadow faculty". University professors would be in the school teaching preservice and inservice courses and conducting research in tandem with the school's faculty.

The return on this $135,000 investment[12] would be a vibrant school, which would be likely not only to train 15 well-prepared teachers and one excellent administrator, but also to provide an exemplary education for students in the school as well as meaningful and accessible inservice training for the school's current staff. These schools would be ideal to use as magnets for desegregation and other district purposes. The contribution that research in this collaborative arrangement could make to our knowledge of effective teaching and curricular practices is very promising. In whatever way these gains are quantified, the partner school concept would seem to promise an impressive social return on investment.

5. Funding

An underlying theme throughout this paper has been the fundamental dissimilarities between K-12 and higher education in this country. As would be expected, the funding mechanisms for these two institutions reflect these differences. The funding of a state's various public universities reinforces a hierarchical structure with the "flagship institution" receiving a higher level of funding per student credit hour than is the case for regional universities. At the elementary and secondary level, "most state school finance programs have been designed so that primary emphasis has been placed upon a large fiscal equalization program" (Salmon, Dawson, Lawton, & Johns, 1988, p. 2). Whether intentionally or not, the method by which a program is financed sets parameters within which the organization must operate. The extension of either

---

12 This assumes that the three additional teachers and the half-time replacement for the preservice principal are near the beginning of their careers and that their average salary and benefits are therefore no more than $30,000 per teacher.

the higher education or the K-12 funding system to finance partner schools erects significant barriers to the operation of such schools.

If partner schools are considered to be an extension of K-12 school districts and are therefore financed through a state's existing school funding formula, local taxpayers (who provided 44 per cent of K-12 revenue in the U.S. during the 1987-88 school year) will find their local tax dollars supporting the preparation of teachers who may decide to seek positions in other school districts upon graduation. In order to protect the return on their investment, local citizens may seek some form of indentured servitude on the part of preservice graduates of these schools in return for local financial support. Such an arrangement, while somewhat justifiable on financial grounds, raises profound questions concerning the mission of these partner schools and the propriety of involving state university employees in its delivery.

Operating partner schools as extensions of the state university system runs into several difficulties. Philosophically, the idea of channelling higher revenue per pupil to partner schools affiliated with the state's "flagship institution" than is provided to partner schools affiliated with other public universities in the state runs counter to prevailing norms in public school finance. In addition, universities are not currently organized to deal with the complexities involved in operating an elementary or secondary school. Unless partner schools exclude special needs students from their program, which seems totally inconsistent with their purpose, provision would have to be made within the university for administering special education and other categorical programs. Practicalities such as these would require the establishment of a relatively expensive bureaucracy within the university; the financial feasibility of this arrangement is subject to question.

A possible solution would be to develop a governing structure for partner schools which is independent from, but in alignment with, both institutions. In recognition of the "golden rule" of educational finance (they who have the gold, make the rules), both the university and the school district must remit a measure of their authority to this joint venture and allow partner schools to act as financially independent entities. Fundamental to the partner school concept is a commingling of the previously separate realms of preservice, induction, and inservice training. Unless funding is also commingled, with control vested in the partner schools, the probability that these institutions will produce substantive change in the practices of either schools and colleges of education or elementary and secondary schools is severely diminished.

While independence is crucial, if partner schools are to flexibly use resources from both sets of institutions, this structure should be closely aligned with both institutions and designed to be compatible with their separate funding schemes. The university-school district partnership envisioned for this enterprise should be financed from three sources: (1) The partner school's share of school district revenue, (2) University revenues which are generated by partner school activities, and (3) The additional state funding required to

adequately staff partner schools as described in the previous section.[13]

This approach, although it reflects current funding schemes, provides the basis for a significantly realtered institutional alignment. Funds generated from school district coffers are indistinguishable from funds generated from higher education; all resources are partner school resources. Dissolution of this barrier is important because, for example, if the staff of a partner school chooses to deviate from the district-negotiated work or salary agreement, it is free to use its own resources to do so. Rather than being in a situation where funding drives programs, partner schools will be in a situation where they could channel limited resources to those projects which yield the greatest return in the desired outcomes.

In addition, the funding plan outlined above calls for substantial financial outlays by both the universities and the school districts. This commitment helps

---

13 An example of how this might work is:

Partner School Budget equals
(Adjusted school district revenue * Partner school enroll. as per cent of school district enrollment)
+ (Adjusted university funding per credit hour * Student credit hours)
+ {(Non-classroom time as per cent of teaching time) * (Number of interns) * (Beginning salary & benefits)}

Where: Adjusted school district revenue = (District A's total revenue) - (District A's non-instructional central office expenditures) [to be defined in accordance with state accounting system]
Partner school enrollment as per cent of school district enroll. = (Partner school's enrollment) ÷ (District A's enrollment)
Adjusted university funding per credit hour = (University's tuition per credit hour) + (State higher ed. support per credit hour) - (University's administrative expenditures per credit hour)
Student credit hours = (Preservice credit hours earned at partner school) + (Inservice credit hours earned at partner school)
Non-classroom time as per cent of teaching time = (Number of minutes per day of non-classroom faculty time allotted per intern per day) ÷ (Number of minutes taught per day by a full-time teacher)
Number of interns = Number of interns assigned to partner school
Beginning salary & benefits = District A's beginning salary plus benefits

to tie both the institutions and their personnel to the project. As Clift and Say (1988) point out, "Participants (in a collaboration) with no professional, emotional, or financial investment in the success of the program are not likely to maintain the program" (p. 6).

In order to exist and provide for the mutual self-interest of all parties involved, partner schools must use resources in innovative, possibly rule-breaking ways. This suggests that rather than regulating specific activities, an appropriate role for the state department of education would be to set the goals and standards which partner schools must meet, furnish the appropriate expertise and resources, and then hold these schools accountable for meeting these standards. State departments should be encouraged to use the principle of "management by exception" in their dealings with partner schools, and devolve a considerable degree of authority to them in how school resources are used.

6. Governance

The partner school concept calls not only for a reallocation of resources between school districts and universities, it also demands a redefinition of role relationships. Ferver (1981) outlines the current relationships as:

	DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY		
Participant	Preservice Education	Induction	Inservice Education
University	Primary	Joint	Resource
School District	Resource	Joint	Primary

The current discontinuity in responsibility for preservice education, induction, and inservice education is unsustainable with partner schools. In the current preservice arrangement, universities assume primary responsibility for the content and shape of preservice education while school districts serve essentially as apprenticeship sites. The move to intimately involve school district personnel, students, and facilities in the delivery of this program necessitates a strong voice for school district personnel in the design, implementation, and administration of the partner school preservice program. In a similar manner the current primacy of school district personnel with respect to inservice education is unrealistic if university personnel are to be meaningfully involved in on-going attempts to address the problems and needs of the school's staff.

If human and financial resources are to be reallocated in the pursuit of broadened knowledge and better procedures, then program governance must be reshaped as well. While it is not feasible to specify what all aspects of such a governing structure would look like, several necessary attributes seem clear. As explained in the previous section, if school districts and universities are to share jointly in the responsibility for partner schools, some form of university-school district coalition seems desirable. Such a partnership should be vested with responsibility for the content, shape, and delivery of preservice, induction, and inservice education. Partner schools governance would therefore be seen by all involved as a collective enterprise, with neither the university nor the school district in a dominant role in financial or curricular matters. In order to most efficiently apply available partner school resources, such decisions should not be made by mandate at the state, university, or school district level, but

instead should evolve based upon the shared judgement of the parties involved.

Another desirable attribute is the meaningful inclusion of all groups responsible for implementing the simultaneous renewal of public schools and colleges of education in the planning of these changes. Representatives of each of these six groups (teachers, principals, central office staff, professors, and university administrators, state education department officials) should be voting members on the partner school planning team with: (1) an equal number of school staff (teachers and principals) and professors; (2) equal representation from schools and universities; (3) state department representation which is significant, but less than the number of members from schools or universities. As an example, an 8-member board could be composed of one teacher, one principal, one central office administrator, two professors, one university administrator, and two state education department officials.

This governing structure must be sufficiently flexible and meet often enough to react to changes in the partner school environment. While a coordinator will be employed to facilitate and act as intermediary among the various groups, this planning team must work closely with the coordinator to meet the goal of including those responsible for implementing the program in its planning.

7. Conclusion

The partner school concept represents an attempt to reshape the relationship between public schools and colleges of education to provide for

more effective preservice and inservice education, improved educational programs for K-12 students, and an expanded knowledge base for dealing with the instructional, curricular, and organizational reform agenda facing schools. The success of this venture hinges upon six factors: (1) The ability of partner schools to increase the efficiency of the current teacher preparation model in order to provide compensation (in terms of time and task) for the inevitable losses involved with the introduction of partner schools; (2) The development of a priority-driven distribution scheme to meet the needs and expectations of each impacted group; (3) The creation of a managerial structure which will work with, but is not answerable to either the universities or the school districts, and is vested with the responsibility for preservice education, induction, and inservice education; (4) The integration of K-12 and higher education personnel into a unit guided by a common body of understandings, with the ranks of the former being bolstered by 5-10 per cent in order to adequately staff partner schools and provide the time needed to reflect upon current practices and work with university faculty in creating knowledge upon which effective new practice can be based; (5) A reordering of priorities within higher education which reflects the current rhetoric concerning the importance of teacher and administrator training; and (6) Provision of ample resources to support the jurisdictional and staffing revisions outlined above.

Given this rather daunting list, how feasible is the partner school concept? While this paper has argued that partner schools offer outstanding potential for furthering the goals of state policy makers, university faculty members, and school district personnel, anyone cognizant of the realities of K-12 and higher education recognizes the difficulties inherent in such fundamental change. Resistance is sure to be engendered in school districts

and in universities which will make the likelihood of any short-term success tenuous.

Discernable progress, though, is being made. Beginning with the 1989-90 academic year, four school districts and the University of Washington are operating a pilot partner school project in the Seattle metropolitan region. In addition, school-university partnerships are already in place throughout the U.S.[14] which could provide ready bases for much of the organizational structure needed to support partner schools. The remaining financial and governance questions, while complex, would not appear to present any insurmountable difficulties. Thus, while numerous challenges remain, mild optimism seems warranted. Hopefully, the concepts outlined in this paper can serve as a basis for increased articulation between universities and K-12 schools which could provide the impetus for substantial renewal in preservice education, induction of new teachers, on-going professional development of current staff, while supporting meaningful research into the myriad of problems facing our educational system.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Nathalie Gehrke, John Goodlad, Perry Keithley, Ken Sirotnik, and Roger Soder for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this paper. Any remaining deficiencies, though, are solely my responsibility.

---

[14] For example, the National Network for Educational Renewal consists of 14 school-university partnerships in as many states.

8. References

Clark, R. W. (1986). School/university relations: Partnerships and networks (Occasional Paper No. 2). Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Educational Renewal.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). Ed school: A brief for professional education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clift, R. T., & Say, M. (1988). Teacher education: Collaboration or conflict? Journal of Teacher Education, 39(3), 2-7.

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in education. Elementary School Teacher, 4, 193-204.

Ferver, J. C. (1981). University collaboration in school inservice. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15, 22-72.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1987). Linking schools and universities: Symbiotic partnerships (Occasional Paper No. 1). Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Educational Renewal.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). The National Network for Educational Renewal: Past, present, future (Occasional Paper No. 7). Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Educational Renewal.

Hanushek, E. A. (1986). The economics of schooling: Production and efficiency in public schools. Journal of Economic Literature, 24, 1141-1177.

Kemmerer, F., & Wagner, A. P. (1985). The economics of educational reform. Economics of Education, 4, 111-121.

Musgrave, R. A., & Musgrave, P. B. (1984). Public finance in theory and practice (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Salmon, R. G., Dawson, C., Lawton, S. B., & Johns, T. L. (1988). Public school finance programs of the United States and Canada, 1986-87. Blacksburg, VA: American Education Finance Association and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Samuelson, P. A. (1965). Foundations of economic analysis. New York: Atheneum Publishers.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schlechty, P. C. and Vance, V. S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 106-112.

Sichel, W. and Eckstein, P. (1974). Basic economic concepts. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Strike, K. (1988). The ethics of resource allocation in education: Questions of democracy and justice. In D. H. Monk, & J. Underwood (Ed.), Microlevel school finance: Issues and implications for policy (pp. 143-180). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Tresch, R. W. (1981). Public finance: A normative theory. Plano, TX: Business Publications.

Weaver, W. T. (1983) America's teacher quality problem: Alternatives for reform. New York: Praeger.